UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,657	11/07/2002	Heng-Chien Chen	TRUP0005USA	8001

27765 7590 04/22/2005

NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE (NAIPC)
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER	
SCUDERI, PHILIP S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2153	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/065,657	CHEN, HENG-CHIEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip S. Scuderi	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 November 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *7, 13, and 14* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 November 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informality: "control signals inputted the keyboard". Examiner suggests "control signals inputted *by* the keyboard". Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claims 13 and 14 are objected to because of the following informality: "between the first transceiver and to the second transceiver". Examiner suggests "between the first transceiver and the second transceiver". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the adapter comprising" in line 4. It is unclear which adapter applicant is referring to. Examiner suggests "*each* adapter comprising".

6. Claim 1 recites the limitation "sending the control signals to the first transceiver of the adapter and for wirelessly receiving the status signals sent from the first transceiver of the adapter" in lines 9-11. It is unclear which adapter, control signals, and transceiver applicant is

referring to. Examiner suggests "sending control signals to the first transceiver of one of the plurality of adapters and for wirelessly receiving the status signals sent from the first transceiver of said one of the plurality of adapters".

7. Claims 2, 6, 9, and 12 recite the limitation "the adapter of the computer system further comprises" in lines 1-2 of each respective claim. It is unclear which adapter applicant is referring to. Examiner suggests "the adapter of said one of the plurality of computer systems further comprises".

8. Claim 7 recites the limitation "the first transceiver of the adapter" in line 4. It is unclear which adapter and transceiver applicant is referring to. Examiner suggests "the first transceiver of said one of the plurality of computer systems".

9. Claims 13 and 14 recite the limitation "the first transceiver" in lines 2 and 2 respectively. It is unclear which transceiver applicant is referring to. Examiner suggests "the first transceiver of said one of the plurality of computer systems".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schneider et al. (U.S. 6,304,895, hereinafter "Schneider").

12. With respect to claim 1, Schneider teaches a control system [fig. 1C] comprising:

- a plurality of computer systems [plural independent target computers, col. 5 line 19, fig. 1C shows an independent target computer] each comprising an adapter [fig. 1C (Target Controller 50)] electrically connected to a computer [fig. 1C (Target Device 20)] for sending signals to [*explanation #1*: col. 5 lines 20-22, Signals must be sent to target computer 20 in order to control it. See the bidirectional arrow connecting the Comm. Devices in fig. 1C.] and receiving signals from the computer [col. 6 lines 26-33], the adapter comprising a first transceiver [fig. 1C (Comm. Device 53 directly attached to Target Device 50)] for wirelessly [*explanation #2*: Comm. Device 53 on Controlling computer 12 may include a wireless transceiver for wirelessly communicating with Target controller 50 as disclosed in col. 4 line 65 – col. 5 line 3. In this case, Comm. Device 53 on Target device 20 must have wireless communication capabilities.] sending status signals [col. 6 lines 26-33] and for wirelessly [see explanation #2 above] receiving control signals [col. 5 lines 20-22]; and
- a console comprising:
  - a controller [fig. 1C (Controlling computer 12)] for controlling communications between the console and the computer system [col. 5 lines 20-22], the controller comprising a second transceiver [fig. 1C (Comm device 53)] for wirelessly [col. 4 line 65 – col. 5 line 3] sending the control signals to the first transceiver of the adapter [col. 5 lines 20-22, also see explanation #1 above] and for wirelessly [see explanation #2 above] receiving the status signals sent from the first transceiver of the adapter [col. 6 lines 26-33, See the bidirectional arrow connecting the Comm Devices in fig. 1C.];

- at least one input device connected to the controller for inputting the control signals to the controller [fig. 1C (Keyboard 122, Mouse 124), col. 5 lines 20-22]; and
- at least one output device connected to the controller [fig. 1C (120)] for outputting the status signals received by the second transceiver of the controller [col. 6 lines 26-33, col. 5 lines 24-27].

13. With respect to claim 2, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 1. Schneider further discloses that the adapter of the computer system further comprises a first processor electrically connected to the first transceiver for controlling operation of the adapter [col. 13 lines 28-29].

14. With respect to claim 3, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 2. Schneider further discloses that the controller of the console further comprises a second processor [fig. 2 (CPU 106), col. 3 lines 58-62] electrically connected to the second transceiver [Fig. 1C shows a diagram of Controlling computer 12 comprising Comm device 53 (the second transceiver).] for controlling operation of the controller [The CPU controls the operation of the console and therefore controls the operation of the Comm. Device 53.].

15. With respect to claim 4, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 3. Schneider further discloses that the input device is a mouse connected to the controller of the console [fig. 1C (124)], and the control signals inputted from the mouse to the controller [col. 5 lines 20-22] are wirelessly [col. 4 line 65 – col. 5 line 3] transmitted from the second transceiver

to the first transceiver of the adapter [col. 5 lines 20-22, also see explanation #1 above] such that the mouse connected to the console is capable of controlling the computer connected to the adapter [col. 5 lines 20-22].

16. With respect to claim 5, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 4. Schneider does not expressly disclose that the controller of the console further comprises a mouse receiver circuit electrically connected between the second processor and the mouse for sending the control signals received from the mouse to the second processor. However, such a mouse receiver circuit is inherent in the teachings of Schneider. Without a receiver circuit, mouse 124 could not communicate with Controlling computer 12.

17. With respect to claim 6, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 4. Schneider further discloses that the adapter of the computer system further comprises a mouse driver circuit electrically connected between the first processor and the computer for sending control signals from the adapter to the computer [See the bidirectional arrow in fig. 1C labeled "M" connecting the Target controller 50 (the adapter) and the Local KBD, Mouse & Video.].

18. With respect to claim 7, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 3. Schneider further discloses that the input device is a keyboard [fig. 1C (122)] connected to the controller of the console [see fig. 1C], and the control signals inputted the keyboard to the controller are wirelessly [col. 4 line 65 – col. 5 line 3] transmitted from the second transceiver to the first transceiver of the adapter [col. 5 lines 20-22, also see explanation #1 above] such that

the keyboard connected to the console is capable of controlling the computer connected to the adapter [col. 5 lines 20-22].

19. With respect to claim 8, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 7. Schneider does not expressly disclose that the controller of the console further comprises a keyboard receiver circuit electrically connected between the second processor and the keyboard for sending the control signals received from the keyboard to the second processor. However, such a keyboard receiver circuit is inherent in the teachings of Schneider. Without a receiver circuit, keyboard 122 could not communicate with Controlling computer 12.

20. With respect to claim 9, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 7. Schneider further discloses that the adapter of the computer system further comprises a keyboard driver circuit electrically connected between the first processor and the computer for sending control signals from the adapter to the computer [See the bidirectional arrow in fig. 1C labeled "K" connecting the Target controller 50 (the adapter) and the Local KBD, Mouse & Video.].

21. With respect to claim 10, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 3. Schneider further discloses that the output device is a video monitor [figs. 1C and 2 (120)] connected to the controller of the console [see fig. 1C], and the status signals of the computer that are wirelessly transmitted by the first transceiver to the second transceiver are video signals

that are displayed on the monitor for providing a video status of the computer to the console [col. 5 lines 24-27, col. 6 lines 26-33].

22. With respect to claim 11, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 10. Schneider does not expressly disclose that the controller of the console further comprises a video driver circuit electrically connected between the second processor and the monitor for sending the video signals received by the second processor to the monitor. However, such a video driver circuit is inherent in the teachings of Schneider. Without a driver circuit, monitor 120 could not display video signals captured by the target computer as disclosed in col. 5 lines 24-27.

23. With respect to claim 12, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 10. Schneider further discloses that the adapter of the computer system further comprises a video receiver circuit electrically connected between the first processor and the computer for sending video signals received from the computer to the first processor [See the bidirectional arrow in fig. 1C labeled "V" connecting the Target controller 50 (the adapter) and the Local KBD, Mouse & Video.].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider in view of *802.11 – Webopedia.com* (3/21/2002, URL: "http://web.archive.org/web/20020802230924/http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/8/802_11.html", hereinafter "Webopedia").

26. With respect to claim 13, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 1. Schneider does not expressly teach that the wireless signals transmitted between the first transceiver to the second transceiver are direct sequence spread spectrum signals. Schneider is silent with respect to the specification of the wireless signals. It was well known in the art to connect wireless clients using direct sequence spread spectrum signals, as evidenced by Webopedia. In a similar art, Webopedia teaches connecting wireless clients ["802.11 specifies an over-the-air interface between a wireless client and a base station or between two wireless clients"] using direct sequence spread spectrum signals ["**802.11b** (also referred to as *802.11 High Rate* or *Wi-Fi*) -- an extension to 802.11 that applies to wireless LANS and provides 11 Mbps transmission (with a fallback to 5.5, 2 and 1 Mbps) in the 2.4 GHz band. 802.11b uses only DSSS."]. Given the teachings of Webopedia it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the wireless signals transmitted between the first transceiver to the second transceiver direct sequence spread spectrum signals. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow wireless functionality comparable to Ethernet [Webopedia "802.11b was a 1999

ratification to the original 802.11 standard, allowing wireless functionality comparable to Ethernet"].

27. With respect to claim 14, Schneider teaches the control system applied to claim 1. Schneider does not expressly teach that the wireless signals transmitted between the first transceiver to the second transceiver conform to the IEEE 802.11b networking standard. Schneider is silent with respect to the specification of the wireless signals. It was well known in the art to connect wireless clients using the IEEE 802.11b networking standard, as evidenced by Webopedia. In a similar art, Webopedia teaches connecting wireless clients ["802.11 specifies an over-the-air interface between a wireless client and a base station or between two wireless clients"] using the IEEE 802.11b networking standard ["**802.11b** (also referred to as *802.11 High Rate* or *Wi-Fi*) -- an extension to 802.11 that applies to wireless LANS and provides 11 Mbps transmission (with a fallback to 5.5, 2 and 1 Mbps) in the 2.4 GHz band. 802.11b uses only DSSS."]. Given the teachings of Webopedia it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt the wireless signals transmitted between the first transceiver to the second transceiver to conform to the IEEE 802.11b standard. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow wireless functionality comparable to Ethernet [Webopedia "802.11b was a 1999 ratification to the original 802.11 standard, allowing wireless functionality comparable to Ethernet"].

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5pm.

30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

31. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PSS

Primary Examiner